UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Philadelphia, PA CR-05-440

VS.

February 25, 2008

ALTON COLES a/k/a NASEEM COLES, et al.,

Defendament Dep. Clerk

TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL
BEFORE THE HONORABLE R. BARCLAY SURRICK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: MICHAEL J. BRESNICK, ESQUIRE

RICHARD A. LLORET, ESQUIRE

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

615 Chestnut Street, Suite 1250

Philadelphia, PA 19106

For the Defendant:

Alton Coles

CHRISTOPHER D. WARREN, ESQUIRE

Law Office of Christopher Warren

1500 Walnut Street Philadelphia, PA 19102

For the Defendant:

Timothy Baukman

JACK J. McMAHON, JR., ESQUIRE Law Office of Jack McMahon 1500 Walnut Street, Suite 900

Philadelphia, PA 19102

Audio Operator

INNA GOLDSHTEYN

Transcribed by:

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING

P.O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026-129

(856) 435-7172

FAX: (856) 435-7124

Email: Dianadoman@comcast.net

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service



AH

(Appearances continued)

For the Defendant: Monique Pullins

For the Defendant: Asya Richardson

For the Defendant: Thais Thompson

For the Defendant: James Morris LAURENCE HARMELIN, ESQUIRE

P.O. Box 3574

Westchester, PA 19381

RONALD A. SMITH, ESQUIRE Ronald A. Smith and Associates 1617 JFK Boulevard, Suite 1240

Philadelphia, PA 19103

PAUL J. HETZNECKER, ESQUIRE 1420 Walnut Street, Suite 911

Philadelphia, PA 19102

RONALD THOMPSON, ESQUIRE

3002 Lincoln Drive

Suite J

Marlton, NJ 08053

WAYNE POWELL, ESQUIRE 811 Church Road 101 Parragon Building Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

			3
1		I N D E X	
2	Requested excerpted portions of trial as follows:		
3		PAGE	
4	Jury Charge	4	
5			
6	Jury question	64	
7			
8	EXHIBITS:	<u>Ident.</u>	Evid.
9	FOR THE COURT:	ar Ar ar	
10	C-1 Index of calls	75	ų.
11	C-2 Index of exhibits	75	
			5
	161		

Jury Charge 4 (Court in Session) 1 THE CLERK: ... now in session, the Honorable R. 2 3 Barclay Surrick presiding. 4 COUNSEL: Good morning, Your Honor. MR. MCMAHON: Good morning, Your Honor. 5 MR. LLORET: Good morning, Your Honor. 6 MR. WARREN: Good morning, Judge. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. Have a seat. 8 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, do you anticipate we'll 9 take a break before you actually finish the charge this 10 morning? 11 It's possible that that will happen. 12 THE COURT: We'll see how quickly it goes. 1.3 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I'm working on an issue with 14 Mr. Lloret, and he's very graciously accommodated me, but he 15 and I need to get something worked out before you finally send 16 the jury in to deliberate, but if we can have an opportunity to 17 18 do that, perhaps --THE COURT: Well, we'll see how quickly it goes, 19 20 Mr. Thompson. MR. THOMPSON: Very good. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: I'd like to get the charge completed as 22

soon as possible, but we may very well take a break depending on how long it is.

23

24

25

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Well, I'm ask -- even if you do

Jury Charge

finish the charge, if you would just give us a short time to work on our issue, I would imagine by the time we address it, it will only take a moment or so.

THE COURT: All right.

1.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Please rise.

(Jury in)

THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you're all rested after a nice weekend. Ladies and gentlemen, on Friday when we recessed, I had just completed giving you the instruction with regard to managing and controlling premises used for storing or distributing controlled substances. I'm now going to talk to you about the crime of investing drug proceeds in an enterprise in interstate commerce.

The indictment in this -- in this case alleges in Count 176 that from on or about January 11, 2002 to on or about April 5, 2002, Defendant Alton Coles received income which was derived directly or indirectly from the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base in which conspiracy he was a principal and that he knowingly and intentionally used and invested part of that income in the acquisition of an interest in an enterprise, that enterprise being Take Down Limited and the production partnership which were engaged in and the activities of which affected interstate commerce. That is --

Jury Charge

those are the facts that are alleged against Mr. Coles in Count 176.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Code says that it shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived directly or indirectly from a violation of this subchapter or subchapter 2 of this chapter punishable by imprisonment for more than one year in which such person has participated as a principal directly or indirectly invest any part -- any income or proceeds in the acquisition of an interest or an -- or the establishment or operation of any enterprise which is engaged in or the activities of which affect interstate commerce. That is the statutory provision that we're dealing with here in Count 176.

Now, in order to find the defendant guilty of investing drug income in an interstate enterprise, the Government has to prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant was a principal in the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base alleged in Count One of the indictment; second, that defendant received income from that conspiracy; third, that the defendant knowingly and intentionally invested or used part of that income to acquire an interest in or to establish or operate an enterprise; and fourth, that the enterprise was engaged in or its activities affected interstate or foreign commerce. Those are the elements of the crime.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've told you before that a person may be guilty of an offense because he personally committed the offense or because he aided and abetted another in committing the offense. The United States Code provides whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures its commission is punishable as a principal. It also provides that whoever willfully causes an act to be done, which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, a person is punishable as a principal.

Ladies and gentlemen, the offense of investing drug income in an interstate enterprise requires that the Government prove that the defendant acted knowingly and intentionally with respect to that third element of the crime, and as I've told you, to prove that a defendant acted knowingly, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was conscious and aware of the nature of his actions and of the surrounding facts and circumstances as specified in the definition of the offense charged.

To prove that a defendant acted intentionally, ladies and gentlemen, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt either that it was defendant's conscious desire or purpose to act in a certain way or to cause a certain result or that defendant knew that he was acting in that way or would -- or would be practically certain to cause that result.

Again, as I've told you before, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly and intentionally, you may consider evidence about what the defendant said, what the defendant did or failed to do, how the defendant acted, and all of the other facts and circumstances shown by the evidence that may prove what was in the defendant's mind at the time. Ladies and gentlemen, the Government is not required to prove that the defendant knew that his acts were against the law.

Now, what is an enterprise, ladies and gentlemen?

The term enterprise includes any individual, partnership,

corporation, association, or other legal entity and any union

or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal
entity.

In this matter, ladies and gentlemen, the parties have stipulated that the entities that are alleged in Count 176, that is, Take Down and its production partnership, Get That Dough, were enterprises under the statutory definition.

whether the enterprise was engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or affected interstate or foreign commerce through its activities. Interstate commerce is commerce between two or more states or between one state and the District of Columbia or between a state and the United States territory or possession. Foreign commerce is commerce between the United States or any state and another country.

1

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Ladies and gentlemen, if you decide that there was any effect at all on interstate commerce, then that is enough to satisfy this element. The effect can be minimal.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, you do not have to decide whether the enterprise -- the effect of the enterprise on interstate commerce was harmful or beneficial. The Government satisfies its burden by proving an effect on interstate commerce if it proves beyond a reasonable doubt any effect, whether it was harmful or not. The defendant need not have known or intended or anticipated the enterprise's effect on interstate commerce.

And ladies and gentlemen, in this particular matter, the parties, again, have stipulated that the entities alleged in Count 176 were engaged in enterprise. They were enterprises, engaged in an enterprise, engaged in activities which affected interstate commerce.

Those are the elements of the crime of investing drug proceeds in an enterprise in interstate commerce. Government has proven those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty. If the Government has not proven those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's talk about the crime of possessing a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking Counts 63 and 68 of the indictment charge Timothy crime.

Baukman with possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime. Count 67 charges Defendants James Morris and Thais Thompson with this crime. Counts 68, 70, 72, 181, and 182 charge Defendant Alton Coles with this crime.

Defendant Monique Pullins is charged with this crime in Count 70.

Ladies and gentlemen, the offenses alleged in Count One, the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base in Counts 49, 61, and 67 maintaining a property for drug trafficking and Count 62, possession with the intent to distribute cocaine are all drug trafficking crimes.

In order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the Government has proven each of the following two elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant committed the drug trafficking crime which he or she is charged with possessing the firearm in furtherance of; second, that the defendant knowingly possessed a firearm in furtherance of this crime. If you find that the defendant possessed the firearm, you must consider whether the possession was in furtherance of the drug trafficking crime charged.

Ladies and gentlemen, possession in furtherance of means for the purpose of assisting in, promoting, accomplishing, advancing, or achieving the goal or objective of conspiracy to distribute controlled substances, managing and controlling a house for storing and distributing controlled

2.3

substances, or possession with intent to distribute controlled substances.

You should understand that the mere presence of a firearm at the scene is not enough to find possession in furtherance of the alleged underlying drug charge. The firearm's presence may be coincidental or entirely unrelated to the underlying crime.

Some factors that may help you to determine whether possession of a firearm furthers a drug trafficking crime include the following: the type of criminal activity that's being conducted, the accessibility of the firearm, the type of firearm, whether the firearm is stolen, whether the defendant possesses the firearm legally or illegally, whether the firearm is loaded, the time and circumstances under which the firearm is found, and the proximity of the firearm to drugs or drug profits. Those are some of the factors you may consider along with any other factors that you believe are relevant.

Ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crime of possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime. Again, if the Government has proven each of the elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty. If the Government has not proven each of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Let's talk about Counts 59, 60, 69, and 71 of the

indictment. Those counts charge Alton Coles with being a convicted felon in possession of a firearm.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Code, Section 922(g)(1) of Title 18 says that --

"It shall be unlawful for any person who has been convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year to possess in or affecting commerce any firearm or ammunition."

That's what the statute says. In order to find the defendant guilty of this crime, ladies and gentlemen, you must find that the Government has proven the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant has been convicted of a felony, that is, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year; second, that after this conviction, defendant knowingly possessed a firearm. The firearms here are those described in Counts 59, 60, 69, and 71 of the indictment; third, that the defendant -- that the defendant's possession was in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, in order to find the defendant guilty of this offense, you must find that the Government proved that before the defendant -- before the date defendant is charged with possessing the firearm, defendant had been convicted of a crime and that crime was punishable by a term exceeding one year.

You have heard, ladies and gentlemen, that the parties have stipulated that defendant was convicted of a crime in State Court and that this crime is punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. The parties have also stipulated that this felony conviction occurred prior to the time that defendant is alleged to have possessed the firearm or firearms charged in the indictment. Based upon those stipulations, ladies and gentlemen, you should treat these facts as having been proven, but as I said to you before, you're not required to do so since you are the sole determiners of the facts.

Ladies and gentlemen, the fact that defendant was found guilty of another crime on another occasion does not mean that he committed the crimes charged in this indictment, and you must not use his guilt of the other crimes as proof of the crimes charged in this case except for the one element of this crime which I have just given to you. You may find the defendant guilty of this crime only if the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt all of the elements of this offense.

You have heard, ladies and gentlemen, that a firearm is any weapon which expels or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. The term includes the frame or receiver of any such weapon.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, the parties here have

stipulated that the weapons alleged in Count 59, 60, 69, and 71 are firearms within the meaning of the statute. You should therefore treat these -- these facts as having been proven, but again, you're not required to do so, because you are the sole determiners of the facts in this matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, to establish the second element of the offense, the Government has to prove that the defendant possessed the firearm in question. To possess means to have something within a person's control. The Government does not have to prove that the defendant physically held the firearm; that is, that he actually possessed it. As long as the firearm is within the defendant's control, he possessed it.

If you find that the defendant either had actual possession of the firearm or had the power and the intention to exercise control over it, even though it was not in defendant's physical possession, that is, that defendant had the ability to take actual possession of the firearm when defendant wanted to do so, you may find that the Government has proven possession. Again, possession may be momentary or fleeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, in addition, the law recognizes that possession may be sole or it may be joint. If one person alone possesses a firearm, that's sole possession. However, more than one person may have the power and the intention to exercise control over a firearm. This is called joint possession. If you find that the defendant had such power and

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it jointly with another. You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that mere proximity to a firearm or mere presence on the property where it's located or mere association with a person who does

control the firearm or the property is not sufficient to

intention, then he possessed the firearm, even if he possessed

support a finding of possession.

The Government must prove that the defendant knowingly possessed the firearm described in the indictment. This means that the defendant possessed the firearm purposefully and voluntarily and not by accident or mistake. It also means that the defendant knew the object was a firearm.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the third element of this offense, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the possession was -- of the firearm by the convicted felon was in or affecting interstate commerce. means that the Government must prove that at some time before the defendant's possession, the firearm had traveled in interstate commerce.

In this regard, ladies and gentlemen, the defendant and the Government have again stipulated that the firearm alleged in Count 59, 60, 69, and 71, that those firearms were possessed in interstate commerce as I have defined it. other words, they crossed state lines. You should therefore treat this fact as having been established by the evidence.

ے

However, again, you're not required to do so because you are the sole determiners of the facts in this case.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, with regard to Count 60 of the indictment, you heard testimony that on October 24, 2004 when the crime of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon was alleged to have been committed, defendant ran from the police, and he was caught. If you believe defendant ran from the police, then you may consider this conduct along with all of the other evidence in deciding whether the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant committed the crime charged.

This conduct may indicate that the defendant thought that he was guilty of the crime charged and was trying to avoid punishment. On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, sometimes an innocent person may run from the police for some other reason. Whether or not this evidence causes you to find that the defendant was conscious of his guilt of the crime charged and whether that indicates that he committed the crime charged is entirely up to you. You are the sole judges of the facts.

So, ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crime of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. If the Government has established each of those elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of that crime. If the Government has not established each of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt,

you must find the defendant not guilty.

Count 187 of the indictment, that count charges knowing possession of an unregistered firearm, and that count charges Mr. Baukman, Timothy Baukman, with knowingly receiving and possessing an unregistered firearm, namely, a machine gun in violation of the law. The relevant statute here provides as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to receive or possess a firearm which is not registered to him in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record."

Ladies and gentlemen, in order to find the defendant guilty of knowingly receiving and possessing an unregistered firearm, you must find that the Government has established each of the following five elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that defendant knowingly possessed a firearm; second, that the firearm was a machine gun; third, that the defendant knew of the characteristics of the firearm, that is, that it was a machine gun; fourth, that this firearm was in operating condition; and five, that the firearm was not registered to the defendant in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record. It does not matter whether defendant knew that the firearm was not registered or that it had to be registered.

Ladies and gentlemen, to establish the first element of the offense, the Government must prove that the defendant

possessed the firearm in question, and as I just told you a minute ago, to possess means to have something within a person's control. The Government does not have to prove that the defendant physically held the firearm, that he had actual possession of it. As long as the firearm was in -- within the defendant's control, he possessed it.

If you find that the defendant either had actual possession of the firearm or had the power and intention to exercise control over it even though it was not in defendant's physical possession, that is, that the defendant had the ability to take actual possession of the firearm when the defendant wanted to do so, you may find that the Government has proven possession. Again, ladies and gentlemen, possession may be momentary. It may be fleeting.

Mere proximity to a firearm or mere presence on the property where it's located or mere association with persons who -- a person who does control the firearm or the property is insufficient to support a finding of possession. Ladies and gentlemen, proof of ownership is not required.

Again, the Government must prove that the defendant knowingly possessed the firearm described in the indictment, and this means that the defendant possessed the firearm purposefully and voluntarily and not by accident or mistake. It also means that the defendant knew that the object was a firearm.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, the Government must prove that the defendant knew of the characteristics of the firearm, that is, the defendant knew that the firearm was a machine gun. Ladies and gentlemen, for purposes of this instruction and as defined by the statute, the term machine gun means any weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot automatically more than one shot without manual reloading by a single function of the trigger.

Those are the elements of the crime of possessing an unregistered firearm, to wit, a machine gun. If the Government has established each of those elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of that charge. If the Government has not proven each of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're working through the crimes charged. There are several more to define for you, and the next one we're going to talk about is the crime of money laundering.

Counts 89 through 175 of the indictment charge the defendant Timothy Baukman with money laundering. Counts 78 and 79 charge the defendant Alton Coles with this crime. Defendant Asya Richardson is charged with this crime in Count 79.

Ladies and gentlemen, the relevant Federal statute provides in part --

"Whoever knowing that the property involved in a financial transaction represents the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity, conducts or attempts to conduct such a financial transaction which, in fact, involves the proceeds of specified unlawful activity with the intent to promote the carrying on of the specified unlawful activity or whoever knowing that the transaction is designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, the location, the source, the ownership, or the control of proceeds of specified unlawful activity is guilty of a crime."

Ladies and gentlemen, for purposes of this provision,

a financial transaction shall be considered to be one involving the proceeds of specified unlawful activity if it is part of a set of parallel or dependent transactions, any one of which involves the proceeds of specified unlawful activity and all of which are part of a single plan or arrangement.

Now, in order to find the defendant guilty of money laundering, the Government must prove the following four elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that on or about the dates alleged in the indictment, the defendant conducted a financial transaction which affected interstate commerce; second, that the defendant conducted the financial transaction with the proceeds of specified unlawful drug-related activity, that is, the conspiracy to distribute cocaine or cocaine base

1.6

as charged in Count One of the indictment; third, that the defendant knew that the transaction involved the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity; and fourth, as to Counts 89 through 120, that Defendant Baukman conducted the financial transactions with the intent to promote the carrying on of the specified unlawful activity; that is, the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base as alleged in Count One; as to Counts 78, 79, and 121 through 175, that Defendants Coles, Richardson, and Bachman conducted the financial transactions with knowledge that the transactions were designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds of the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base as alleged in Count One of the indictment.

Ladies and gentlemen, the first element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant conducted a financial transaction. The term conducts includes initiating, concluding, or participating in initiating or concluding a transaction. You should also understand that the term transaction means a purchase, sale, loan, pledge, gift, transfer, delivery, or other disposition of property or with respect to a financial institution includes deposits, withdraws, transfers between accounts, exchanges of currency, loans, and any other payment, transfer, or delivery by, through, or to a financial institution by whatever means

affected.

Ladies and gentlemen, financial transaction means any transaction as I've just explained that term which in any way or degree affects interstate commerce and involves one or more monetary instruments or involves the use of a financial institution which is engaged in or the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce in any way or degree.

In this matter, ladies and gentlemen, the parties have again stipulated that the transactions alleged in Counts 78, 79, and 89 through 175 are financial transactions as defined -- as I just defined those terms. You should therefore treat these facts as having been proven, but again, as I've said before a number of times, you're not required to do that, because you are the sole determiners of the facts. As I said to you just a couple of minutes ago, the term interstate commerce as used in these instructions means commerce between any combination of states, territories, possessions of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

Ladies and gentlemen, the parties here have stipulated with regard to that element, the interstate commerce element, that the financial institutions involved in the transactions alleged in Counts 78, 79, and 89 through 175 were engaged in and had activities which affected interstate and foreign commerce. You should therefore treat those facts as having been proven, but you're not required to do so, because



you are the sole determiners of the facts.

5

Ladies and gentlemen, proceeds of specified unlawful activity, the term proceeds as used in these instructions means any property or any interest in property that someone acquires or retains as a result of criminal activity. Proceeds may be

derived from an already completed offense or from a completed

phase of an ongoing offense.

You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that the Government is not required to prove that all of the funds involved in the charges transactions were the proceeds of specified unlawful activity. A financial transaction involves proceeds of a specified -- of a specified unlawful activity even when proceeds of a specified unlawful activity are commingled in an account with funds obtained from legitimate sources.

It's sufficient, ladies and gentlemen, if the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that at least part of the funds involved in the transaction represent such proceeds of specified unlawful activity.

Ladies and gentlemen, the third element of this crime that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that in conducting a financial transaction, the defendant knew that the property involved in the financial transaction represented some form of -- proceeds from some form of unlawful activity. To satisfy this element, the Government must prove

that the defendant knew that the property involved in the transaction represented proceeds from some form of unlawful activity, that is, a felony offense under State, Federal, or foreign law. The Government is not required to prove that the defendant knew what the unlawful activity was.

In this case, ladies and gentlemen, the Government contends that the defendants knew that the proceeds were derived from unlawful activity, that is, the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base, which is a felony under Federal law.

Ladies and gentlemen, as to Counts 89 through 120, the final element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant, Baukman, in conducting the financial transactions intended to promote the carrying on of the specified unlawful activity, that is, intended to promote the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base. As to Counts 78, 79, and 121 through 175, the final element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the Defendants Coles, Richardson, and Baukman in conducting the financial transactions intended to conceal or disguise the nature, the source, the ownership, or the control of the proceeds of the specified unlawful activity, proceeds from the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base.

Ladies and gentlemen, whether a defendant intended to promote the carrying on of the conspiracy to distribute cocaine

and cocaine base or whether the defendant knew that the purpose of the financial transactions was to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds of the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base may be established by proof that the -- of the defendant's actual knowledge, by circumstantial evidence, or by the defendant's willful blindness. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, you're entitled to find based upon the circumstances surrounding the financial transaction or the attempted transaction the purpose of the activity and defendant's knowledge.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the offense of money laundering requires that the Government prove that the defendant acted with the intent with respect to an element of the offense. This means that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt either that it was defendant's conscious desire or purpose to act in a certain way or to cause a certain result or that defendant knew that he or she was acting in that way or would be practically certain to cause that result.

In deciding whether a defendant acted with intent, you may consider evidence about what the defendant said, what the defendant did or failed to do, how the defendant acted, and all of the other facts and circumstances shown by the evidence that may prove that a -- what the defendant's state of mind was at the time.

Now, with regard to the offense of money laundering, let's talk about the money laundering in Count 79. of money laundering in Count 79 requires proof that the defendant Asya Richardson acted knowingly. If you find that the defendant Richardson acted in good faith, that would be a complete defense to the charge, because good faith on the part of the defendant Richardson would be inconsistent with her acting knowingly.

1.8

You should understand that a person acts in good faith when he or she has an honestly held belief or opinion or understanding that the acts in question were not unlawful even though the belief, opinion, or understanding turns out to be inaccurate or incorrect. Thus, in this case, if Defendant Richardson made an honest mistake or had an honest misunderstanding about whether her actions were unlawful, she did not act knowingly.

Defendant Richardson did not act in good faith, however, if even though she honestly held a certain opinion or belief or understanding, she also knowingly made false statements, representations, or promises to others. You should understand that Defendant Richardson does not have the burden of proving good faith. Good faith is a defense, because it's inconsistent with the requirement of the offense charged that the defendant Richardson acted knowingly.

As I've told you, it's the Government's burden to

prove beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the offense including the mental state. In deciding whether the Government has proven that defendant Richardson acted knowingly or instead, whether Defendant Richardson acted in good faith, you should consider all of the evidence presented that may bear on Defendant Richardson's state of mind.

If you find from the evidence that Defendant Richardson acted in good faith as I defined that term for you or if you find for any other reason that the Government has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant Richardson acted knowingly, you must find the Defendant Richardson not guilty of the offense of money laundering.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as I have instructed, to find the defendant, Asya Richardson guilty of money laundering, you must find that the Government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant Richardson knew that the property involved in the financial transactions alleged in Count 79 represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity. In this case, there is a question of whether Defendant Richardson knew this alleged fact.

When, as in this case, ladies and gentlemen, knowledge of a particular fact or circumstance is essential -- is an essential part of the offense charged, the Government may prove that the defendant knew that fact or circumstances if the evidence proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant

closed her eyes to what would otherwise have been obvious to her.

You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that no one can avoid responsibility for a crime by deliberately ignoring what's obvious. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, you may find that the Defendant Richardson knew that the property involved in the financial transaction represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity based on evidence which proves that she was aware of the high probability of this fact and she consciously and deliberately tried to avoid learning about this fact.

You may not find that the defendant Richardson knew that the property involved in the financial transactions represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity if you find that the defendant actually believed that this fact did not exist. Also, you may not find that the defendant Richardson knew that the property involved in the financial transaction represented the proceeds from some form of unlawful activity if you find only that defendant Richardson should have known the fact or that a reasonable person would have known the fact -- would have known of a high probability of that fact.

It's not enough, ladies and gentlemen, that Defendant Richardson may have been stupid or foolish or may have acted out of inadvertence or accident. You must find that Defendant Richardson was actually aware of a high probability that the

property involved in the financial transaction represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity, deliberately avoided learning about it, and did not actually believe that the property was not proceeds from some form of unlawful activity.

Ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crimes of -- the crime of money laundering. If the Government has established each of the elements of the crime in each count beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of that crime. If you find that the Government has not met its burden of proof, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Now, in Count 77, ladies and gentlemen, Defendant Coles is charged with knowingly conspiring and agreeing with Kristina Latney to commit the crime of money laundering. In Count 80, the defendant Coles and Asya Richardson are charged with that crime, conspiracy -- agreeing together to commit the money laundering in violation of federal law. Let's talk about Count 77 and 80 for just a minute.

Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1956H makes it a federal crime for anyone to conspire or agree with someone else to do something which, if actually carried out, would be a violation of the money laundering statute, and I've just given you the elements of money laundering.

In order to find the defendant guilty of conspiracy

2

3

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to launder money, you must find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following two elements: first, that two or more persons in some way or manner came to a mutual understanding to try to accomplish a common and unlawful plan, that is, to violate the federal money laundering statute, and second, that the defendant, knowing of the unlawful purpose of the plan, willfully joined in that plan.

As I've told you already, under the law, a conspiracy is an agreement or a kind of partnership in criminal purposes. In a conspiracy, each member of the conspiracy becomes the agent or the partner of every other member of the conspiracy.

You should understand that a person may become a member of a conspiracy without full knowledge of all of the details of the unlawful scheme. So if a defendant has a general understanding of the unlawful purpose of the plan and knowingly joins in that plan on one occasion, that is sufficient to convict the defendant of conspiracy even though the defendant did not participate before or even though the defendant played only a minor part, and as I've told you, mere presence at the scene of a transaction or event or the mere fact that certain persons may have associated with each other and they have assembled together and discussed common aims and interests does not standing alone establish proof of a conspiracy. Also, ladies and gentlemen, a person who has no knowledge of a conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which

advances some purpose of a conspiracy does not thereby become a conspirator.

Ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crime of conspiracy to commit the crime of money laundering.

If the Government has established each of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of that crime. If the Government has not met its burden, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Let's talk about the crime of wire fraud. Counts 87 and 88 of the indictment charge Alton Coles and Asya Richardson with the crime of wire fraud. Ladies and gentlemen, the relevant statute makes it a crime for anyone to use interstate wire communications facilities in carrying out a scheme to defraud.

In order to find the defendant guilty of wire fraud, you must find that the Government has established each of the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant devised a scheme to defraud or to obtain money or property by materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises; second, that the defendant acted with the intent to defraud; and third, that in advancing, furthering, or carrying out the scheme, the defendant transmitted any writing, signal, or sound by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce or caused the transmission of any writing, signal, or sound by

means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce. Fourth, ladies and gentlemen, if you find that the defendant has committed the first three elements that I just went through with you, you must also then determine whether the wire fraud scheme affected a financial institution, and you must make that finding beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let's talk about a scheme to defraud or to obtain money by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises. The first element, ladies and gentlemen, is that the defendant knowingly devised a scheme to defraud in this instance Chase Bank of money or property by materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises.

You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that a scheme is merely a plan for accomplishing an object. Fraud is a general term which embraces all of the various means by which one person can gain the advantage over another by false representations, suppression of the truth, or deliberate disregard of the truth. So, ladies and gentlemen, a scheme to defraud is any plan, device, or course of action to deprive another of money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises reasonably calculated to deceive persons of average prudence.

In this case, the indictment alleges that the scheme to defraud was carried out by making false and fraudulent claims and documents. The representations that the Government

_

charges were made as part of a scheme to defraud, and they're set forth in the indictment.

The Government is not required to prove every misrepresentation charged in the indictment. It's sufficient if the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the alleged material misrepresentations were made in furtherance of the alleged scheme to defraud. However, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot convict the defendant unless all of you agree as to at least one of the material misrepresentations.

You should understand that a statement, representation, claim, or document is false if it is untrue when made and if the person making the statement, representation, claim, or document or causing it to be made knew that it was untrue at the time that it was made. A representation or statement is fraudulent if it was falsely made with the intention to deceive.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, deceitful statements of half truths or the concealment of material facts or the expression of an opinion not honestly entertained may constitute false or fraudulent statements. The arrangement of words or the circumstances in which they're used may convey the false and deceptive appearance.

You should understand that deception need not be premised on spoken or written words alone. If there is

....

deception, the manner in which it is accomplished is immaterial.

The false or fraudulent representation, ladies and gentlemen, must relate to a material fact or matter. A material fact is one which would reasonably be expected to be of concern to a reasonable and prudent person in relying upon the representation or statement in making a decision with respect to the granting of a loan in this instance.

This means, ladies and gentlemen, that if you find that a particular statement of fact was false, you must determine whether the statement was one that a reasonable person might have considered important in making his or her decision. The same principle applies to fraudulent half truths or omissions of material fact. In order to establish a scheme to defraud, the Government must also prove that the alleged scheme contemplated depriving another of money or property.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not necessary that the Government prove that the defendants actually realized any gain from the scheme or that the intended victim actually suffered a loss. In this case, it so happens that the Government does contend that the proof establishes that persons were defrauded and that the defendants realized gain, although whether or not the scheme actually succeeded is really not the question. You may, however, consider whether it succeeded in determining whether the scheme existed.

If you find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the scheme to defraud charged in the indictment did exist and that the defendants knowingly devised or participated in the scheme charged, you should then consider the second element of the offense. The second element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is the -- that the defendants acted with the specific intent to defraud.

To act with the intent to defraud, ladies and gentlemen, means to act knowingly and with the intention or purpose to deceive or cheat. In considering whether defendants acted with the intent to defraud, you may consider, among other things, whether they acted with a desire or purpose to bring about some gain or benefit to themselves or someone else or with a desire or purpose to cause some loss to someone.

beyond a reasonable doubt is that in advancing, furthering, or carrying out the scheme, defendants transmitted a writing, signal, or sound by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce or caused such a transmission to be made. The phrase transmits means -- let me start again. The phrase transmit by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce means to send from one state to another by means of telephone or telegraph lines or by means of radio or television. The phrase includes a telephone conversation by a person in one state with a person

Jury Charge

in another or an electronic signal sent from one state to another such as a fax or a financial wire. Ladies and gentlemen, the Government is not required to prove that the defendants actually used a wire communication in interstate commerce or that defendants even intended that anything be transmitted in interstate commerce by means of wire or radio or television communication to further or to advance or to carry out the scheme to defraud or to obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises. However, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a transmission by a wire or radio or television communication facility in interstate commerce was, in fact, used in some manner to further or to advance or to carry out the scheme to defraud.

The Government must also prove either that the defendant used the wire, radio, television communication in interstate commerce or the defendant knew that the use of the wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce would follow in the ordinary course of business events or that the defendant should reasonably have anticipated that the wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce would be used.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not necessary that the information transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate commerce itself was false or

fraudulent or contained any false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises or contained any request for money or anything of value. However, the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the use of the wire, radio, television communication in interstate commerce furthered or advanced or carried out the scheme in some way.

You should understand that each transmission by wire communication in interstate commerce to advance or further or carry out a scheme may be a separate violation of the wire fraud statute, and in this situation, ladies and gentlemen, the parties have stipulated that Chase Bank, the entity identified as the victim of the fraud alleged in Counts 87 and 88 was a financial institution within the meaning of the United States Code.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you find that the Government has established each of the elements of the crime of wire fraud beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of that crime. If you're not satisfied that the Government has met its burden, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have a couple of additional crimes to go through and then some final instructions for you, but in looking at the clock, I'm going to take a brief recess, let you go out, relax for a few minutes, and then we'll bring you back and give you the final

Jury Charge

instructions.

Recess for ten minutes.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. Have a seat. We are coming down the home stretch. Ladies and gentlemen, Counts 81 through 86 of this indictment charge the defendant, Alton Coles, with structuring a currency transaction, charge him with structuring to evade the reporting requirements under federal law.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Code makes it a crime for anyone to structure any transaction with one or more domestic financial institutions in order to evade the reporting requirements under the law. Section 5313(a) of the Code in its implementing regulations require the filing of a government form called a currency transaction report or a CTR. Those regulations require that every domestic financial institution which engages in a currency transaction over \$10,000 must file a report with the Internal Revenue Service furnishing, among other things, the identity and address of the person engaging in the transaction, the person or entity, if any, for whom he is acting, and the amount of the currency transaction. That currency transaction report must be filed within 15 days of the transaction.

In order to find the defendant guilty of structuring a currency transaction to evade reporting obligations, you must

find that the Government has established the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant knew that a financial institution was legally obligated to report currency transactions in excess of \$10,000; second, that defendant engaged in structuring of a currency transaction; and third, that the defendant acted with the intent to evade the reporting requirement.

With regard to the first element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, it must prove that at the time the transaction described in the indictment occurred, defendant knew that a financial institution was legally obligated to report currency transactions in excess of \$10,000. You should understand that under the law, a financial institution is defined as an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

Now, I just stated that under Section 5313, a financial institution is required to file a report with the Federal Government any time that the transaction involved is \$10,000 or more in United States currency. That report you've heard referred to is what I said a minute ago. It's called the CTR.

In order to satisfy the first element, the Government must prove that the defendant knew that the financial institution involved would be required to file that CTR for any currency transaction in excess of \$10,000. The question is

whether a person acted -- the question of whether a person acted with knowledge is a question of fact for you to determine, like any other fact question.

Direct proof of knowledge is not always available, and such proof is not required. The ultimate fact of whether someone knew something at a particular time, though subjective, may be established by circumstantial evidence based upon a person's outward manifestations, his words, his conduct, his acts, and all of the surrounding circumstances disclosed by the evidence and the rational and logical inferences to be drawn from that evidence.

The second element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant engaged in structuring of a currency transaction. You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that a currency transaction is any financial transaction which includes the physical transfer of currency. For example, taking a check to the bank and cashing it is a currency transaction, but depositing a check in a bank is not. Similarly, purchasing something and paying for it in cash is a currency transaction, but paying for it with a check or a credit card is not.

As I instructed you before, engaging in a currency transaction in an amount greater than \$10,000 requires the financial institution to file that CTR. You should understand that structuring a transaction occurs when a person acting

alone or with others conducts or attempts to conduct one or more currency transactions in any amount at one or more financial institutions on one or more days for the purpose of evading reporting -- the reporting requirements that I just described to you.

Structuring includes but it's not limited to breaking down a sum of currency exceeding \$10,000 into smaller amounts, each less than \$10,000, and then conducting a series of separate currency transactions in those smaller amounts in order to avoid the reporting requirement. The transactions need not exceed \$10,000 in any single financial institution or on any single day in order to constitute structuring.

The third element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant engaged in structuring with the intent to avoid or to evade that reporting requirement. As I've indicated to you, a person acts intentionally when he acts deliberately and purposefully, and defendant's acts must have been the product of defendant's conscious object rather than the product of mistake or accident.

You should understand that direct proof of defendant's intent is almost never available. However, sometimes it can be shown that a person wrote or stated that at a given time, that person intended a particular result.

Direct proof is not required however. The ultimate

fact of intent, though subjective, may be established by circumstantial evidence based upon defendant's outward manifestations, his words, his conduct, and his acts and all of the surrounding circumstances disclosed by the evidence as well, again, as the -- the rational and logical inferences to be drawn from those circumstances.

So, ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crime of structuring to evade the reporting requirements. If the Government has established each of those elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of that crime. If the Government has not met its burden, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Let's talk now about Counts 189, 190, and 191 of the indictment. They charge the defendant, Thais Thompson, with making materially false statements in her grand jury testimony.

Ladies and gentlemen, the relevant federal statute makes it a federal offense to knowingly make a false material declaration to a grand jury under oath. In order to find the defendant guilty of making false statements under oath, you must find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of the five following elements: first, that the defendant gave testimony under oath before a federal grand jury; second, that defendant testified as detailed in the indictment; third, that the testimony was false; fourth, that the defendant knew that the testimony was false when she gave

it; and fifth, that the false statement was material.

Ladies and gentlemen, a declaration is false if it is untrue when it is made. You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that a declaration is material to the grand jury's investigation if it is capable of affecting or influencing the grand jury inquiry or decision. It is not necessary for the Government to prove that the grand jury was, in fact, misled or influenced in any way by the false declaration.

Ladies and gentlemen, Counts 189, 190, and 191 of the indictment allege that the defendant, Thompson, knowingly made several false statements under oath. In order for you to convict, the Government is not required to prove and you need not find that all of the statements alleged to be false in Count 189 and Count 190 and Count 191 of the indictment are false. The Government, however, must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that at least one specific statement alleged in Count 189 or Count 190 or Count 191 was false.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not sufficient that some members of the jury agree that one statement is false while other members of the jury agree that another statement is false. There must be at least one specific statement that each of you agree was false and that each of you agree that the defendant knew to be false.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt and you must unanimously find

Jury Charge

defendant made the statement.

that at least one of the same statements alleged in Count 189, in Count 190, in Count 191 of the indictment was false and that the defendant knew that the statement was false when the

Ladies and gentlemen, it's a defense to the charge of making materially false statements to the Federal grand jury as charged in Counts 189, 190, and 191 if the evidence shows either of the following: first, that the defendant made a statement in response to a question that was ambiguous or capable of being understood in more than one way and the answer given by the defendant to one reasonable interpretation of the ambiguous question was not false; second, that defendant made a statement in response to a question that was clear and unambiguous but the answer to the clear question was ambiguous and capable of being understood in more than one way and one reasonable interpretation of the answer given by the defendant was not false.

Ladies and gentlemen, as long as a statement or an answer to a question or a reasonable interpretation of both statements and answers are literally or technically true, the crime of making a false statement to a federal grand jury alleged in Count 189, Count 190, Count 191 of the indictment has not been made out.

In considering the testimony alleged to be false, you should view the context and sequence of the question and

1

3

4 5

6

8

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Words used in both should be given their normal and customary meaning unless the context in which the words were used clearly shows that both the person asking the question and the witness giving the answer mutually understood that some other meaning was to be given to the word or words.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you find that a statement or an answer was literally or technically true, then any intent on the part of the defendant to be ambiguous or to confuse or to evade or even to mislead is irrelevant and you must find the defendant not guilty.

So, ladies and gentlemen, those are the elements of the crime of making a false statement to a federal grand jury. If you find that the Government has established each of those elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant quilty of the crime. If you find that the Government has not met its burden, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, the last crime that I'm going to define for you -- and you don't have to start clapping -- is the crime of accessory after the fact to the crime of conspiracy. Count 192 of the indictment charges that on or about June 7, 2005, Defendant Thais Thompson acted as an accessory after the fact to the crime of conspiracy to distribute 5 kilograms or more of cocaine or 50 grams or more of cocaine base committed by James Morris.

You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that it's a Federal crime for a person to act as an accessory after the fact. An accessory after the fact is a person who, knowing that the offense against the United States has been committed by another, receives, relieves, comforts, or assists that person in order to hinder or prevent that person's arrest, trial, or punishment.

In order to find the defendant, Thais Thompson, guilty of being an accessory after the fact, you must find that the Government has established the following three elements beyond a reasonable doubt: first, that the defendant, Morris, committed each of the elements of a crime of conspiracy to distribute 5 kilograms or more of cocaine and 50 grams or more of cocaine base, which elements I have discussed with you already; second, that the defendant, Thompson, knew that Morris committed the crime; and third, that with that knowledge,

Defendant Thompson in some way assisted Defendant Morris in order to hinder or prevent the defendant Morris's arrest or trial or punishment for the crime of conspiracy to distribute the cocaine or cocaine base.

Those are the elements of the crime of being an accessory after the fact. If the Government has established each of those elements by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of the crime. If the Government has not met its burden, then you must find the

defendant not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, those are all of the crimes that I'm going to define for you. I'm going to talk to you for a few minutes about accomplice liability and a couple of other subjects, and then I'm going to give you some final instructions on how you should conduct your deliberations.

Several counts in this indictment you will see allege that defendant committed and aided and abetted the commission of an offense charged in that count. A person may be guilty of an offense because the person personally commits the offense or because the person aided and abetted another in committing the offense. A person who has aided and abetted another in committing an offense is often called an accomplice. A person who is an accomplice -- the person who the accomplice aids and abets is known as the principal.

In order to find a defendant guilty of an offense because the defendant aided and abetted the principal in committing the offense, you must find that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt the following four requirements: first, that the alleged principal committed the offense charged by committing each of the elements of the offense charged as I have given you those elements; second, that the defendant knew that the offense charged was going to be committed or that they were being committed by the alleged principal; third, that the defendant did some act for the

purpose of aiding, assisting, soliciting, facilitating, or encouraging the alleged principal in committing the offense and with the intent that the alleged principal would commit the offense; and fourth, that the defendant's acts did in some way aid, assist, facilitate, or encourage the allege principal to commit the offense.

Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant's acts need not themselves be against the law. You should understand that evidence that a -- that the defendant was merely present during the commission of an offense is not enough for you to find him or her guilty as an aider and abetter. In addition, if the evidence shows that the defendant knew that the offense was being committed or was about to be committed, but does not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it was the defendant's intent or purpose to aid, assist, encourage, facilitate, or otherwise associate himself or herself with the offense, you may not find the defendant guilty of the offense as an aider and abetter.

The Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant in some way participated in the offense committed by the alleged principal as something that the defendant wished to bring about or to make succeed.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, during the course of this trial, some of the defendants testified while others did not. You should understand, ladies and gentlemen, that a defendant

has an absolute constitutional right not to testify. A defendant has an absolute right not to offer evidence. A defendant does not even have to cross-examine witnesses.

The burden of proof, ladies and gentlemen, remains with the Government throughout the entire trial and never shifts to a defendant. The defendant is never required to prove that he or she is innocent.

Ladies and gentlemen, you must not attach any significance to the fact that a defendant did not testify. You must not draw any adverse inference against the defendant because he or she did not take the witness stand. Do not consider for any reason at all the fact that a defendant did not testify. Do not discuss that fact during your deliberations or let that fact influence your decision in any way.

Now, during the trial, you heard testimony of witnesses and you heard arguments by counsel that the Government did not use specific investigative techniques in this case. You heard evidence and arguments that fingerprint evidence was not offered, DNA analysis and the use of narcotics detection equipment was not used.

Ladies and gentlemen, you may consider these facts in deciding whether the Government has met its burden of proof, because I told you you should look at all of the evidence presented or the lack of evidence presented in deciding whether

the defendant is guilty or not guilty. However, ladies and gentlemen, you should understand that there is no legal requirement that the Government use any specific investigative techniques.

There is no requirement that the Government use all possible investigative techniques. There is no requirement that the Government attempt to take fingerprints or offer fingerprint evidence or gather DNA analysis or use narcotic detection equipment. Your concern, ladies and gentlemen, in this matter is to determine whether or not based upon the evidence presented the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. That should be the focus of your inquiry.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, you heard evidence during this trial that Monique Pullins, Asya Richardson, and Thais Thompson have a reputation in the community for being law-abiding citizens. This testimony, ladies and gentlemen, this character evidence should be considered by you alone with all of the other evidence in the case in deciding whether the Government has proved the crimes charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, those are the instructions that I'm going to give you with regard to the law, with regard to the evidence, with regard to the crimes charged. Let me talk to you now about your deliberations when you go out to deliberate in this case.

Jury Charge 51 Ladies and gentlemen, the first order of business for 1 2 you should be the selection of a foreperson. MR. HETZNECKER: Your Honor, can I see you one 3 4 moment? (At sidebar) 5 The instruction on offering willful 6 MR, HETZNECKER: 7 blindness and good faith with respect to Thais Thompson on accessory after the fact was omitted. It was part of your 8 instructions as drafted and not part of what you just read to 9 10 the jury. 11 THE COURT: I don't believe that it's an appropriate instruction with regard to the accessory after the fact. 12 MR. HETZNECKER: Well, Your Honor -- Your Honor 13 provided it in your -- you changed your mind then? 14 THE COURT: The final instructions that will go out 15 16 with the jury will not include that. A FEMALE SPEAKER: You took out --17 THE COURT: What? 18 A FEMALE SPEAKER: -- willful blindness, and 19 remember, you took out good faith as well. 20 THE COURT: That's right. It's not appropriate. 21 MR. HETZNECKER: I don't think you made that ruling. 22 I got -- the packet that I received had both --23 THE COURT: Well --24

25

MR. HETZNECKER: -- willful blindness and good faith.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, we have been putting this together and if I didn't get the final draft, that's --

MR. HETZNECKER: It was my expectation that this was going to be in it. So --

THE COURT: Well --

A FEMALE SPEAKER: Can I just tell you, our -- we understood that his representation was that the good faith was only in response to willful blindness.

THE COURT: That's true.

MR. HETZNECKER: So Your Honor's position is this will not be read to the jury?

THE COURT: I don't believe it is appropriate to read it to the jury at this juncture.

MR. HETZNECKER: Note my objection for the record.

THE COURT: All right.

(Sidebar concluded)

THE COURT: Okay. As I was saying, the first order of business for you should be the selection of a foreman, forelady, foreperson. The foreperson has the following responsibilities, first of all, to see that the deliberations get started, see that they are conducted in an orderly fashion.

The foreperson will also speak for the jury in open court. The foreperson will fill out the verdict slip that I will send out with you, and the foreperson will sign that verdict slip, and for all of that work, the foreperson doesn't

get one penny more than the rest of you. So make your decision as to who the foreperson of the jury is going to be, and go on to the more important issues that you have to decide in this matter. You should understand that the views or the vote of a foreperson is not entitled to any greater weight than the views of all of your fellow jurors.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to remind you that your verdict, whether it's guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. To find any of the defendants guilty of an offense, every one of you must agree that the Government has overcome the presumption of innocence with evidence that proves each element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. To find any defendant not guilty, every one of you must agree that the Government has failed to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you decide that the

Government has proven any defendant guilty, then it's my

responsibility to decide what is an appropriate penalty. You

should not consider any possible penalty or any future

consequence of your verdict. Your job is to determine whether

based upon the evidence and testimony presented, the Government

has proven the charge beyond a reasonable doubt. If you

determine that it has, then it becomes my responsibility to

deal with the matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, I've told you several times

Jury Charge

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that your verdict must be based upon the evidence received in this case and the law as I've given it to you. If I've said anything during the course of this trial or done anything during the course of the trial that you think indicates how I feel about this matter, you are absolutely wrong. It is your job to decide this case. As I told you earlier, it's my job to make rulings with regard to evidence and see that these parties get a fair trial. It's your job to determine whether the Government has met its burden of proof.

54

Ladies and gentlemen, now that all of the evidence is in and you've heard all of the arguments of counsel and you've heard the instructions of the Court, you are finally free to talk about this case in the jury room. I have cautioned you every time you've left the jury box not to do that, but when you go out to deliberate, it's your duty to talk with each other about the evidence that you heard and to make every reasonable effort to reach a unanimous agreement. You should talk to each other. You should listen carefully to each other's views. You should keep an open mind and listen to what your fellow jurors have to say. You should not hesitate to change your mind if you become convinced that other jurors are right and that your original position was incorrect, but, ladies and gentlemen, you do not ever have to change your mind just because other jurors see things differently or just because you want to get the case over.

Ladies and gentlemen, your vote must be exactly that, your own vote. It's important for you to reach a unanimous agreement but only if you do so honestly and in good conscience and if you listen carefully to your fellow jurors and decide the case based upon the evidence presented.

Ladies and gentlemen, nobody is going to be allowed to hear your discussions in the jury room, and no record will be made of what you say. You should all feel completely free to speak your mind.

If you elected to take notes during the course of this trial, and I saw that many of you were, your notes should be used only as a memory aid. You should not give your notes any greater weight than your independent recollection of the evidence. You should rely upon your own independent recollection of the evidence or the lack of evidence, and you should not be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors. Notes are not entitled to any more weight than the memory and impressions of each juror.

Ladies and gentlemen, once you start your deliberations, don't talk about the case to the court officials or to me or to anyone else. If you have a question or you have a message that you want to send to the Court, the foreperson should write down that question or message on a piece of paper, sign it, and give it to the court officials who will give it to me. I will talk with the lawyers about your inquiry, and I

_

will respond as soon as I can. In the meantime, you should go on, if possible, and continue your deliberations.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to send out a number of exhibits with you. If you want to see any other exhibits that have not been sent out, you should send a message out. I will talk with counsel, and we will determine whether I can appropriately give you what you've requested.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, don't write down or tell anyone how you or anyone else has voted during the course of your deliberations. That information should stay secret until you've finished your deliberations. If you have occasion to communicate with the Court while you're deliberating, do not disclose the number of jurors who have voted one way or the other in the matter.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the verdict slip. I have prepared the verdict slip that is rather long, and this is going to go out with you. When you reach a unanimous verdict, the foreperson should write the verdict on the form, should date and sign the form, and return it to the Court and give the form to my deputy who will give it to me.

If you decide that the Government has proven a defendant guilty of any of the offenses charged beyond a reasonable doubt, say so by having your foreman mark the appropriate place on this verdict slip. If you decide that the Government has not proven a defendant guilty by some or all of

3

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the evidence of a crime charged, say so by having your foreperson mark the appropriate place on the verdict slip.

Now, that -- this verdict slip goes through each of the crimes that I've just spent a lot of time defining for you. For example, the first crime is Count One, the conspiracy to distribute cocaine and cocaine base. Each count describes what the charge is and the person who is charged in that count. instance, in Count One, charges Alton Coles, Timothy Baukman, James Morris, and Monique Pullins with conspiracy to distribute controlled substances, we, the jury, unanimously find as follows, and then you go down through. You'll see first is Alton Coles, a place to mark either guilty or not guilty, whatever your finding is. The next page, Timothy Baukman, guilty or not guilty. Next, James Morris, guilty or not guilty with regard to Count One. Next, Monique Pullins, guilty or not quilty on Count One, and it goes through each one of the counts in the indictment in exactly the same manner. It tells you what the crime is, who is charged, and then gives you the opportunity to make your finding on the appropriate line.

Ladies and gentlemen, you're here to determine whether the Government has proven the guilt of the defendant for the charges in the indictment beyond a reasonable doubt. You're not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person or persons. So if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

guilt of a defendant, then you should find the defendant guilty even though you may believe that one or more other persons are also guilty, but if any reasonable doubt remains in your mind, ladies and gentlemen, after an impartial consideration of all of the evidence in the case, it's your duty to find a defendant not guilty.

Now, when you go out to deliberate, only 12 jurors can go out. We have a number of alternate jurors in this case, and we selected alternate jurors in the event that something were to occur during the course of the trial so that one of the original jurors could not say. That happened in one instance, but, ladies and gentlemen, only 12 of you are going to go out to deliberate.

The alternate jurors, we are going to impose upon you for a while longer. We are going to take you separately to a jury room to be by yourselves so that in the event that something were to occur with one of the original 12 who's deliberating, we would have the ability to move an alternate juror into the jury room for the deliberations, but alternate jurors, when you go out to the jury room that you will be using, you're not to discuss this case among yourselves. If you are ultimately selected to go into the jury room and take the place of one of the original 12, at that point, you will have the opportunity to discuss this matter with your fellow jurors with a view towards reaching a verdict in the case.

Jury Charge

1.

So with that, do we have the marshal? By the way, ladies and gentlemen, I told you that the -- we had made a copy of the charge that I just spent two days giving to you. You will take that out with you, and you will have that with you so that you can take a look at it as you go through the charges here, the different counts in the indictment, and you can then see what it was that I said with regard to the law in each of the instances.

Mr. Finney, will you swear the --

THE CLERK: Marshal --

THE COURT: -- Marshal?

THE CLERK: -- will you please raise your right hand state your name for the record?

MARSHAL HIPPLE: Marshal Gary Hipple, H I P P L E.

(Marshal Sworn)

of you, you're going to go out to the jury room to begin your deliberations. You'll have as much time as you need to reach a fair decision in this matter.

As I said, I'm going to talk with counsel. We will send exhibits out with you, and if there is anything else you need during the course of your deliberations, you should write it down. The foreperson should write it down, and I will address it.

The alternate jurors will be taken to an alternate

Jury Charge

retiring room. All right?

I understand the alternates have your clothing and coats and everything in Mr. Finney's office. So Mr. Finney will take you to -- out and take you to the jury room that you will be using.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's let them get situated.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Kate, will you go see whether he's cleared the area?

(Pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Finney, take the jurors out.

THE CLERK: Please rise.

(Jury out)

THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat, counsel. What agreements have you reached with regard to these exhibits? You were going to --

MR. WARREN: Judge, I -- I think Mr. Lloret and I have agreed basically to send them out, and he's prepared an index of the tapes by tab number. So if the jurors want to hear a particular tab number or tape, they can just tell us, you know, what it is they want, and I think he's done the same thing with respect to the Government's exhibit list.

MR. LLORET: We do, Your Honor. I think that

Mr. Warren and I and certainly other counsel to the extent that

Colloquy 61

they want to review it, I'd like to finalize the exhibit list.

I have my notes and we've gone over it for several days on the Government's side, those items that have been admitted. I'm sure counsel want to just take a look at that.

I think we should probably eliminate any items that were not admitted, that were identified or not put in. So those -- that's going to have to be an editorial revision.

We'll just have to knock that out over the lunch break, I think, but --

MR. WARREN: I think that's a little bit more practical than -- I mean, we had what, 300 exhibits or something. I don't know how logistically we can --

MR. LLORET: More than that. Yeah.

MR. WARREN: And then this way, if they want to look at something specific, they've got an index. If they want to listen to a specific tape, I think the -- the tapes were referred to by tab number. So their notes would reflect --

MR. LLORET: Probably.

MR. WARREN: -- and the index they have also identifies who the speakers are as well as the date and time of the call. So I think that's enough information for -- to the extent they want to hear one, to tell us we'd like to hear call number such and such, and then I guess we would bring them back out here and play the tape for them.

THE COURT: That would probably be the only way we

Colloguy 62

could do it.

MR. LLORET: Your Honor, we'll have -- I've made arrangements to have all of the documentary and non-contraband exhibits in an office downstairs that we have so that we can react quickly to the jurors if they request certain documents, if we can see -- you know, if they want a whole passel of documents, we can just get them back. The contraband evidence we kept in a locker at ATF, the drugs and guns.

MR. WARREN: They don't get that.

MR. LLORET: But they -- they don't get that, but obviously, I think, Your Honor, if they really need to see it --

MR. WARREN: I've had that. Yeah.

MR. LLORET: -- they could come out and we could display it to them.

MR. WARREN: I've had that happen before, and then -yeah, you just stick it in the box and show it to them. I've
even had it passed around the jury box.

THE COURT: You're suggesting that the non-recorded evidence and the non-contraband not go out unless or until they ask for it.

MR. LLORET: That would be my suggestion only for management purposes, Your Honor. Given the volume of exhibits, I can just envision sort of a swamp of boxes going back there and, you know, things sort of going kerflooey.

	Colloquy 63
1.	Now, it's Your Honor whatever Your Honor cares
2	to do, we'll do.
3	THE COURT: Counsel, any other input?
4	MR. MCMAHON: I think that's I'm agreeable to that
5	position.
6	THE COURT: All right. That's the way we'll handle
7	it then.
8	MR. WARREN: Yeah, because I think we'd fill up
9	the deliberation room with boxes of of materials.
10	THE COURT: No question about that. All right.
11	Mr. Lloret, then you're going to go over the list with counsel,
12	and we'll be back here at 1:30.
13	MR. LLORET: Very well, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, I should place on the
16	record I mentioned I had an issue to resolve with Mr. Lloret.
17	We've been able to do that.
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	MR. LLORET: Thank you, Judge.
20	MR. MCMAHON: That just procedurally, do you want
21	us back here at 1:30?
22	THE COURT: 1:30. Yeah.
23	MR. MCMAHON: Good.
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	(Recess)

Colloguy 64 THE COURT: ...indictment and a copy of the Court's 1 2 charge that we're sending out. Have you had the opportunity to 3 look at it and make sure it's --Judge, I trust the Court. Mr. McMahon, MR. LLORET: 4 however, does not. So --5 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Finney is --6 MR. MCMAHON: I don't trust --7 MR. LLORET: -- just bear that in mind. 8 MR. MCMAHON: -- trust Mr. Lloret. That's who. 9 10 THE COURT: Mr. Finney, as soon as the attorneys have had a chance to take a look at it, take it out. 11 12 (Recess) 13 THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, we've received a note from the foreperson of the jury. I don't know whether you've 14 15 had a chance to take a look at it. They ask for several 16 Let me go down through the list. 17 They ask for Menace tapes. 18 MR. WARREN: They were never admitted into evidence. 19 THE COURT: They were not admitted into evidence, and I will tell the jury that. 20 21 MR. LLORET: Okay. 22 THE COURT: 525HHH red notebook. 23 MR. WARREN: Now, the problem with that, Judge, is 24 you'll recall the portions of the red notebook had some of the

stuff written in back and we couldn't identify who wrote it and

25

	Colloquy 65
1	it's hard but I think what they're referring to, because the
2	next exhibits talk about tally sheets. I think they want
3	like 50 501Z1 is a tally sheet that was seized from Mullica
4	Hill, I believe. All right. 525HHH, they did admit
5	specifically into evidence those tally sheets with
6	THE COURT: I think perhaps what we ought to do is
7	make a copy of the front page of that notebook, and then the
8	tally sheet that was specifically referred to.
9	COUNSEL: Right.
10	MR. MCMAHON: That's I think that's the way to go
11	too.
12	THE COURT: And send that out, and then we have 502P1
13	and
14	MR. MCMAHON: What is that?
15	MR. WARREN: 502P1?
16	MR. HARMELIN: I believe that has to do with my
17	client. 502P1 is a blue tally book, page 3.
18	THE COURT: Right.
19	MR. WARREN: Tally sheets. I think they were looking
20	at the tally sheets.
21	MR. MCMAHON: And it's 501
22	MR. WARREN: 501P1 is a tally sheet for Mullica Hill.
23 24	THE COURT: Okay. So we will give them those. What
25	MR. WARREN: New Jack City: The Next Generation was

Colloquy 66

admitted into evidence.

THE COURT: It was admitted into evidence. There is no way for them to play it in the jury room.

MR. WARREN: That is true, and I think we ought to tell -- that kind of coincides their -- you see where they want phone call transcripts and wires? I think we need to advise them that if they want to hear or see this stuff, they're going to have to send us a note and we'll set it up and play it for them.

THE COURT: I think that's the only way it can be dealt with. There is no way to get it into the jury.

MR. LLORET: I don't know any other way to do it.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Okay.

MR. WARREN: Grand jury testimonies, I mean, that -we can't send -- they don't get that. I mean, they're going to
have rely on their recollection. I think --

MR. LLORET: If they're talking about the -- just the transcripts that were admitted into evidence regarding Thais
Thompson, but it looks like they're asking for everybody's --

MR. MCMAHON: No. That's Thompson, Custis, Latney.
Yeah.

THE COURT: They're asking for everybody's, and I think the most prudent way to deal with that is simply tell them that it's their recollection of the testimony --

MR. WARREN: Right.

Colloguy 67 THE COURT: -- that counts. 1 2 MR. WARREN: Right. That's fair. 3 MR. MCMAHON: MR. HARMELIN: Your Honor, if I may, I noticed on the 4 note there, they squeezed in my client's name next to Faison, 5 and I don't believe there is any grand jury testimony regarding 6 7 that. THE COURT: I don't believe there is either. 8 Organizational charts all for Government 9 MR. WARREN: 10 and defense. Well, I didn't prepare an organizational chart. MR. LLORET: I think --11 MR. WARREN: I think they want the --12 13 -- Government chart, but that's the only MR. LLORET: 14 one. MR. MCMAHON: I think they probably -- I mean, I'm 15 not saying it's admissible, but they're probably referring to 16 the organizational charts I used in my closing argument. 17 18 think that's what they're talking about, because it says -- it says Government and defense, and the only defense 19 organizational chart was the ones that I used in my closing 20 argument. 21 Well, they -- they weren't admitted. 22 MR. LLORET: I didn't say they were. 23 MR. MCMAHON: No. 24 MR. LLORET: No. I know. I didn't say they should be given. 25 MR. MCMAHON:

Colloquy 68

just saying that I think that's what they're referring to.

THE COURT: The Government's charts that were admitted can be sent out, and we can ask them to be more specific about defense charts. There were no defense charts actually offered into evidence in this case, right?

MR. MCMAHON: No. The only defense charts that I think they could possibly be referring to, Your Honor, is the defense chart that I used in my closing argument, the -- because I did a organizational chart myself for the closing argument. If you recall, it's right over there --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MCMAHON: -- which was an organizational chart. So I'm not saying they should have it. I'm just saying that's what they're probably referring to.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LLORET: Your Honor, I'll correct that. I don't think the Government's organizational chart was moved in. I think Mr. --

MR. WARREN: No. That was --

COUNSEL: You're right about that.

MR. WARREN: -- demonstrative, Judge.

MR. LLORET: I think Mr. Bresnick referred to it just as a demonstrative aid during his opening, but we never actually admitted it through a witness.

COUNSEL: That's correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Colloquy 69 I think -- remember, we had a big fight MR. WARREN: about whether or they'd be allow to use -- when you allowed them to use it, it's strictly for demonstrative purposes, and that was solely the use to which it was put. I have it jotted down here, Your Honor, MR. LLORET: but I think -- I just conferred with Mr. Bresnick, and neither of us recall ever actually admitting that. THE COURT: We'll just simply indicate to them that there are no organizational charts that can go out with them. MR. MCMAHON: Well, yeah. I think that's fair, and I think -- but I think you should say that the organizational charts were --MR. WARREN: Not admitted into evidence. COUNSEL: -- no admitted evidence. They were used for demonstrative purposes only. MR. WARREN: Right, They're not evidence. MR. LLORET: And I think the same thing could be said, Your Honor, to sort of put an end to it on the grand jury transcripts, that --MR. WARREN: Yeah. MR. LLORET: -- the only grand jury testimony that was admitted was very specific clips relating to Ms. Thompson, and other than that, there were none admitted. MR. WARREN: They're not in evidence. Yeah.

MR. LLORET:

Yeah.

Colloguy 70 THE COURT: Okay. 1 They want the mortgage file on the Pike 2 MR. WARREN: 3 Creek stuff. That was admitted. THE COURT: That was offered into evidence. 4 5 MR. LLORET: Yes. MR. SMITH: Yeah, but Your Honor, I'm not sure if the 6 7 -- and please correct me if I'm wrong, Your Honor, but I'm not sure if the Pike Creek file was here, that we received 8 everything from Pike Creek. I'm not sure if we have all the 9 10 notes, memos, paperwork in both NVR as well as Pike Creek, but most certainly Pike Creek. 11 12 MR. LLORET: We do. I mean, what's in evidence is in 13 evidence. 14 MR. WARREN: Yeah. 15 THE COURT: All right. MR. WARREN: Take Down's financial records. 16 17 think, they're accepting my invitation to review the stuff that 18 was moved into evidence by the Government that was seized. MR. LLORET: That's in evidence. 19 MR. WARREN: That's in evidence. 20 We have that? 21 THE COURT: 22 MR. LLORET: Yes. That's with Agent -- the various 23 materials that Agent Armstrong testified to. 24 THE COURT: All right. MR. LLORET: That will be available. 25

	Colloquy 71
1	THE COURT: Okay. We'll tell them they can have
2	that.
3	MR. WARREN: Easel and paper. As long as it doesn't
4	say they sold cocaine, I have no objection to sending it back.
5	MR. LLORET: As long as it doesn't have Mr. Warren's
6	notes all over it.
7	COUNSEL: Was that a weasel or easel, Your Honor?
8	THE COURT: We'll send out an easel with a stand so
9	that they can use it for their own purposes.
10	MR. WARREN: And, you know, just for the record, they
11	seemed to have made pretty good notes of what the exhibit
12	numbers were and, you know I don't think they'll have any
13	trouble identifying whatever it is they want. So
14	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Finney well, before we
15	get to that, Mr. Lloret, what do you have?
16	MR. LLORET: Yes, Your Honor. There is two documents
17	that we've we've brought over now, Your Honor. One is the
18	index of calls. Let me hand up a copy of this to Your Honor.
19	the index of calls relates obviously to the various phone calls
20	that were put into evidence.
21	I've been through this on several occasions. The
22	there are actually two indexes. One is by tab and goes
23	sequentially by the tab numbers under which they were
24	introduced

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

25

Colloquy 72

MR. LLORET: -- and it references also the book number, and the second one is actually by exhibit number and cross references the tab. So there is -- there is actually two indexes or indices --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LLORET: -- for the convenience of the jurors.

The second is the Government has put together its final trial exhibit list. I circulated that to defense, and I don't think we have any disputes about the items that the Government contends are in evidence. What we've done, Your Honor, is eliminate the items that were not placed into evidence, and that's -- and that's that.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel agree that the index and the trial exhibit list should go out with the jury?

MR. WARREN: Yes, sir. I've looked at it. It's fine.

THE COURT: No objection?

MR. SMITH: Does the index list have the call -- the intercept by -- introduced by Mr. Warren in here.

MR. WARREN: No, it doesn't. That would be defense exhibit --

MR. HETZNECKER: Judge, we'll try to compile -compile a list of defense exhibits so that can go out as well.
THE COURT: All right.

MR. HETZNECKER: We're in the process of doing that.

Colloguy 73

Judge, may I make a comment about the grand jury notes? I agree generally. The only distinction is because

Ms. Thompson's evidence is specific with respect to an grand jury testimony, I simply would like the jury to be informed that since it was two weeks ago, that if they want to hear it, they can request to hear it rather than sending the transcript out. In other words --

MR. LLORET: It was read to them.

THE COURT: It was read to them, I believe. You don't have a --

MR. HETZNECKER: No, but if it was -- but if they have questions about it, that they're certainly able to hear it again if they want to hear that evidence again as opposed to sending the transcript

THE COURT: You mean it can be read to them again.

MR. HETZNECKER: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WARREN: I've got -- for Mr. Smith's -- I've got DC-10, which was just the transcript of the -- now, I only played four pages.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you make a list of the --

MR. WARREN: We are.

THE COURT: -- defense exhibits, and we will take a look at that and get that out. Okay? Mr. Lloret?

MR. LLORET: I guess the final thing I wanted to ask

Colloguy 74 Your Honor, does Your Honor want these documents for review 1 before they're sent back to the jury or not? 2 THE COURT: I will take a look at them, but counsel 3 have all looked at them. Counsel have agreed that there is no 4 5 problem with sending those out, that they represent an appropriate index of calls, an appropriate index of exhibits. 6 7 MR. MCMAHON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 8 MR. WARREN: Yes, Your Honor. 9 MR. HARMELIN: Yes, Your Honor. 10 MR. WARREN: Like section 4, exculpatory evidence, 11 12 they've carved that out. MR. LLORET: No. None of that in there. Okay. 13 Thanks, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. MR. LLORET: Shall we mark these, Your Honor, in some 16 17 fashion? MR. WARREN: Call them court exhibits. 18 19 MR. LLORET: I can mark them with Government's -pick a Government's exhibit in the 800 series just so that they 20 have an identifier on them for the record. 21 THE COURT: Well, they would not be listed on the 22 23 list though. MR. LLORET: We'd get into a self referential 24

25

problem.

Colloguy

1.4

MR. WARREN: We can have these as -- you know, I've had -- the last time we did that, I think we just marked it as court exhibits.

THE COURT: I think it would appropriate. Counsel have all agreed that they should go out with the jury. We'll mark them as Court exhibit 1 and 2.

MR. LLORET: And, Your Honor, if Your Honor could give -- I always -- I mean, this is a great convenience, I think, for the jury, but if they can be cautioned again that obviously, this is not evidence. It's done for their convenience, and the evidence is -- is the evidence.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LLORET: And their recollection controls.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LLORET: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, I'll hand these up to the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause)

MR. LLORET: Your Honor, Mr. -- Agent Armstrong raises a point which I guess is perhaps we could ask the jurors, if they want the whole 700 series that Agent Armstrong relied upon in creating financial -- obviously, they're available and we can give them back to them. That's a substantial volume of documents. I think at least three or four boxes.

1,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Colloquy 76

We're fine with that, but if they want to be more specific -- I don't know that they can be, but if they can be more specific, we can try to isolate for them, but if they want the whole -- the whole thing, we'll give them the whole thing gladly.

MR. WARREN: Judge, I think they're responding to my argument to take a look at these records, because they weren't really kept all that uniformly or that much together to begin with. I mean, that's --

THE COURT: Well, we will tell them that they're -the documents are in evidence. There are boxes full of them.

If they want to be more specific, they can do that. If they
want --

MR. LLORET: If they want them all --

THE COURT: -- all of them, we will send them out.

MR. LLORET: That's fine. Thank you, Your Honor.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Finney, do you want to bring the jurors in?

(Pause)

MR. LLORET: Your Honor, if I may address something with the Court and with counsel, I'm aware that the -- obviously, the transcripts are not in evidence --

THE CLERK: Please rise.

THE COURT: We'll talk about it at sidebar,

Colloguy

Mr. Lloret.

MR. LLORET: Very well.

(Jury in)

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, have a seat. The foreperson of your jury has sent out a request for certain exhibits. I want to go through your request and tell you what we can give you and what we can't.

Ladies and gentlemen, with regard to the first request, Menace tapes, the Menace tapes were not offered into evidence during the course of this trial. They are not available for your consideration.

Exhibit 525HHH, 502P1, and 501Z1, with regard to 525HHH, to the extent that that was used during the course of the trial, we will send that exhibit out to you. 502P1 and 502Z1 -- 501Z1 we will send out for your consideration.

Ladies and gentlemen, the request for phone calls -phone call transcripts and wires, we do not have an ability to
send out to you the recording or wires of those phone calls.

If you want to hear any phone call, we can play it for you, but
we will have to bring you back into court to hear.

The next request is New Jack City: The Next Generation. Again, that videotape was shown to you. If you wish to see it again, we can play it for you, but it will have to be out here in the courtroom. We can -- we do not have the ability to play that for you back in the jury room.

Colloguy

Ιf

Grand jury testimony, with regard to the grand jury testimony, that testimony was not offered into evidence, and we do not have that testimony for you with the exception you heard read certain excerpts from testimony with regard to Thais Thompson. If you wish to have those sections reread to you, we can do that.

Organizational charts, there were no organizational charts actually offered into evidence during the course of the trial. So those are not available.

NVR mortgage paperwork, Pike Creek file, we have those exhibits. They were offered into evidence during the trial. We will send them out with you.

Take Down financial records, I am advised that the Take Down financial records are in probably four large boxes. We can send those boxes out to you if you want all of those records. They were offered into evidence during the trial. On the other hand, if you request specific records, we will try to find them and give those to you.

So it's entirely up to you, ladies and gentlemen. you want all of the records in the jury room, you may have them. If you want some of them, specify exactly what you'd like to have.

And easel and paper, we can do that. We'll give you an easel and paper and even writing instruments for it. Okay?

Now, for your convenience, ladies and gentlemen,

Colloquy 79

counsel have agreed to send out as -- what we've marked Court exhibit 1, Court exhibit 2. They are an index of the calls that were made and which you heard and which you saw the transcripts of. There is also an index of trial exhibits, all the trial exhibits. Counsel have agreed that this index, court exhibit 1 and court exhibit 2, both accurately reflect the -- and index the calls and index exhibits. So we're going to send that out for your convenience to help you determine what it is you may want to see or hear. Okay?

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to send you back out at this point and ask you to continue your deliberations.

Again, if there are any additional requests and based upon what I have said to you, I imagine there will be. But in any event, write down the request, specific request, and we will attempt to accommodate your request. All right?

Counsel, anything further?

MR. MCMAHON: No, Your Honor.

MR. WARREN: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Finney, you want to take the jury out?

THE CLERK: Please rise.

(Jury out)

THE COURT: Counsel, Mr. Lloret, you were saying something.

MR. LLORET: I was just saying, Your Honor, what

Colloquy 80

we've done is based on the list, we've taken and cleaned out the transcript list. I don't know what counsel's preference is, whether it's just to have the jurors listen to the tapes with transcripts in hand as they listen to the tapes, but I'm going to have to have the staff go and collect those books and get them all cleaned up if we're going to do that. We have to have at least 12 of them cleaned up. So that there are certain tabs in there that need to be pulled and things like that.

MR. WARREN: I mean, there are three transcript books are sitting there --

MR. LLORET: Yeah.

MR. WARREN: -- for them. I mean --

MR. LLORET: I just want to make sure that we look at those books and make sure they conform.

THE COURT: I think you should look at them so that anything that should not be in them at this point is not in them. Counsel, it might save an awful lot of trouble if counsel could agree as to those transcript books and let them go out. Then we would not have the jury coming back trying to hear phone calls, but that's entirely up to you.

MR. LLORET: I'd love to, Judge, but as you'll recall, some of the positions we took is that the transcripts don't accurately --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LLORET: -- reflect what was said on the tapes,

Colloguy 81 and I'd be derelict in my duty if I let them go back there 1 without listening to the stuff. 2 THE COURT: All right. I understand your position. 3 (Pause) 4 THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, is there anything else at 5 this juncture? 6 MR. LLORET: Your Honor, I'll say I'm going to 7 explore with my office the possibility of having a computer 8 that's available with a disk burn. The problems are typically 9 10 that there is also sorts of Government material on these computers in the form of software, but hopefully, I can get one 11 that's clean that the jury can take with it, and that would 12 probably obviate a lot of issues. 13 That would solve a lot of problems. THE COURT: 14 Yeah. If they can do it back there, 15 MR. WARREN: that's fine. 16 I'll look into that. 17 MR. LLORET: All right. MR. WARREN: And assuming that somebody is computer 18 -- I mean, it's a pretty simple exercise. 19 THE COURT: Well, that's the next question, is 20 anybody able to do it. 21 22 MR. WARREN: Anybody on the jury computer -- assuming that -- I'm sure we can just give them a disk burner back there 23 that just has the admissible stuff on it. Then the next 24

question would be can we get somebody back there that actually

25

82 Colloguy play the stuff. 1 THE COURT: I'm sure Agent Horay would be happy to go 2 3 back. MR. WARREN: Oh, I'm sure she would. I'll tell you 4 5 what, you know, and then we can send a representative from the defense back there to, right? 6 MR. LLORET: Well, Your Honor, the other thing was 7 Mr. Hetznecker mentioned that there may be a couple of 8 recordings that need to be added to that list which I don't 9 10 think is as much of a problem is if there is something that needs to be taken off. So I'm going to check that right now. 11 THE COURT: All right. Well, talk to them and --12 13 MR. LLORET: Yeah. THE COURT: -- see whether you agree. 14 15 MR. LLORET: Okay. Okay. The only other comment I'd make is 16 THE COURT: 17 that several of these jurors evidently are smokers, and they have been taken out to smoke privately. 18 I object to that, Judge. You know --MR. WARREN: 19 20 THE COURT: In this day and age, you wonder why anybody would, but in any event --21 Including Mr. Warren. 22 COUNSEL: COUNSEL: Especially Mr. Warren. It really helps 23 with the flu too, you know, but --24 THE COURT: All right. Well, the --25

83 Colloguy MR. WARREN: I have no problem if they go out. 1 2 mean --3 MR. LLORET: No. MR. WARREN: -- none whatsoever, Judge. 4 5 THE COURT: The marshals usually take them down to a private place. 6 MR. LLORET: Well, Your Honor, we have several items 7 8 to take care of and I have to go look at documents, make copies of some of the items like 525HHH. So with Your Honor's 9 10 permission, I'll go take care of those. THE COURT: Go right ahead, and counsel --11 MR. WARREN: I'm here, Judge. 12 13 THE COURT: -- I'm not going to -- I'm going to ask that you stay around to see what may happen next. I don't know 14 how long this -- the jury is going to want to deliberate, and 15 perhaps it won't be necessary for you to be here all the time 16 as long as you're available, but at least for the time being, 17 18 stay around. That's fine. MR. WARREN: 19 20 MR. LLORET: Okay. Thanks, Your Honor. (Recess) 21 Mr. Lloret, there was some question about 22 THE COURT: the indictment that went out and some question about some 23 24 language in it. MR. LLORET: Yes, Your Honor. 25

Colloquy 84

THE COURT: And based upon your agreement with Mr. Powell and Mr. Finney amended the language that was objectionable.

MR. LLORET: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, if I can just -- I'll just make the record. It was at page 20 of the redacted indictment, paragraph 78. This was an allegation that on or about August 10th of 2005, Defendants James Morris and Thais Thompson possessed approximately \$559,396.21 in drug proceeds, and the original read several kilo wrappers. The amendment that's been agreed to by Mr. Powell and Mr. Thompson and I is that it would read in drug proceeds, wrapping material, and then proceed. So it's a neutral language as opposed to the kilo wrappers.

THE COURT: All right. And everyone has agreed that that can be done?

MR. LLORET: Your Honor, there is no objections from other defense counsel. Obviously, this was at the suggestion of Mr. Powell and Mr. Thompson, and I agreed to that.

THE COURT: It's all right.

MR. LLORET: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Finney, would you take the amended --

MR. LLORET: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: -- redacted.

MR. LLORET: The amended redacted. Thank you, Your Honor. Mike, I'll be downstairs.

	Colloquy 85
1	MR. BRESNICK: Fine. I have your cell phone.
2	MR. LLORET: Okay.
3	MR. BRESNICK: Thank you.
4	(Recess)
5	MR. WARREN: I've gone over we've gone over the
6	exhibits, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: I just want to make sure there is no
8	problem.
9	(Pause)
10	THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, Mr. Finney said
11	advised me that you had gotten together the exhibits that the
12	jury requested and you have them, and everybody agrees that
13	they are the proper exhibits and can go out. Is that correct?
14	MR. WARREN: That's correct, Judge. We looked at
15	them, all four of us did.
16	MR. MCMAHON: Yes, we did, Your Honor.
17	MR. WARREN: They're fine.
18	MR. MCMAHON: That is correct.
19	MR. WARREN: And we have not heard back from them on
20	whether or not they what, if anything, they wanted, the Take
21	Down business records. We're just waiting to hear what
22	what, if anything, they've got to say about it. So
23	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hetznecker?
24	MR. HETZNECKER: Yeah. Your Honor, we have a list of
25	defense exhibits that have been handwritten out. We just need

	Colloquy 86
1	copies that we have a copy as well. This will go out as well
2	if the Government is agreeable.
3	MR. LLORET: All right. I'll take a copy and review
4	it, Your Honor, but I don't think I'm going to have a big
5	problem.
6	MR. WARREN Please don't stick it in the tally sheet
7	folder.
8	THE COURT: If there is no objection, Mr. Lloret,
9	just give it to Mr. Finney and he'll take it
10	MR. LLORET: We'll do.
11	THE COURT: out without us convening
12	MR. LLORET: Reconvening.
13	THE COURT: another conference.
14	MR. LLORET: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. WARREN: Do you want us to hang out here, Judge?
17	THE COURT: It's four o'clock. They're going to be
18	going home at 5:00. So yes. Okay.
19	(Recess)
20	THE CLERK: Please rise.
21	(Jury in)
22	THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat, ladies and gentlemen.
23	It is now five o'clock, and we are going to recess for the day,
24	but before we recess, I want to caution you again.
25	The 12 of you who are in the jury room adjacent to

Colloguy

this courtroom and the 6 of you who are in another jury room as alternates, we don't want you discussing this case with anyone, and we don't want anyone discussing the case with you. We're going to ask you to be back tomorrow at 9:15 ready to go.

When you come in tomorrow, the 12 of you who are deliberating at the present time will return to this courtroom and to this jury room adjacent to the courtroom. The alternate jurors, you will return to the jury room that you have been using since the deliberations started.

Don't talk to each other about this case between now and tomorrow morning. When you leave here, you're going to be going home. You may be walking out of here together, but don't discuss the case among yourselves. Do your deliberation in the jury room where they should be done. Don't talk to each other outside of the jury room, and when you return tomorrow, when you return to the jury room, when all of you are assembled, when all of you are there in the jury room, then you can begin your deliberations. I will not bring you back into court tomorrow morning first thing. Just go right into the jury room, and when all of you are there, then you can begin your deliberations tomorrow and continue your deliberations.

And the jurors who are alternates, as I said, you will go back to the jury room that you are using at the present time, and there will be somebody there with you. Okay?

It's five o'clock. We'll see you tomorrow at 9:15.

Colloguy 88 Counsel -- well, ladies and gentlemen, you are excused. 1 Mr. Finney, will you take the jurors out? 2 THE CLERK: Please rise. 3 (Jury out) 4 Okay. Counsel, I'm not going to require 5 THE COURT: 6 that you be here tomorrow at 9:15, but I'm going to require that you give Mr. Finney your cell phone number and that you be 7 available within 15 minutes so that if we get a question or we 8 get a request for an exhibit or something like that, you can 9 get back here and we can deal with it. 10 MR. MCMAHON: Fine. 11 THE COURT: 12 Okay. 13 MR. MCMAHON: Thank you. MR. LLORET: Very well, Your Honor. 14

THE COURT: Okay?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WARREN: No problem, Judge. Very well.

MR. HARMELIN: Your Honor, it's impractical for me -impracticable for me to do anything other than come down since,
you know, I couldn't possibly get here from West Chester in 15
minutes. What time would you like me to be down here? Is 9:30
early enough?

THE COURT: Yes, indeed.

MR. HARMELIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I would think so, and we'll open up the law library downstairs for you.

Colloquy 89

MR. MCMAHON: Go see a movie or something.

MR. HARMELIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Lloret, there was some discussion earlier about whether or not you could make arrangements to get a computer that could --

MR. WARREN: Be used and played by them.

MR. LLORET: Yes.

THE COURT: -- play the audiotapes or videotapes in the jury room. Have you made any progress on that?

MR. LLORET: Yes, Your Honor. I was advised by the computer people over at our office that they'll be able to have a clean computer. They have to go in and inspect the computer and clean it off basically before they give it, but -- but they should have one available by about midmorning tomorrow morning. So we should be in a position. We'll have a disk with all of the pertinent calls or the calls in evidence, and we'll have a computer available for the jury to -- and they can take it back.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then the next problem will be if they make requests of this nature, we're going to have to determine whether anybody on that jury is able to deal with the computer and play the --

MR. LLORET: Judge, I think the --

THE COURT: -- tapes.

MR. LLORET: I anticipate that, although, obviously,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time, gentlemen.

Colloguy 90 we can bring them in here and show them, but I think the program is sufficiently simple in terms of it's really just pull up a screen and double click on the -- on the file that you want, and it's by session number. So I think they'll be in pretty good shape, but we'll -- we'll play that by ear. THE COURT: All right. Deal with that. MR. LLORET: THE COURT: Does any -- do any defense counsel have any objection to that? MR. MCMAHON: No. MR. WARREN: No. In fact --COUNSEL: No. MR. WARREN: -- I think we joined in the request that that option be made -- be made available to the jury. THE COURT: All right. MR. LLORET: The only question I have, Your Honor, is should I have the -- the New Jack City video put on that disk as well? You should certainly do that in the event THE COURT: that they want to see that. MR. LLORET: We'll do that. I think it should be first. MR. WARREN: MR. LLORET: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. We'll see you tomorrow some

I, Maureen Emmons, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Manen Emman

Date:04/21/08

91

MAUREEN EMMONS

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING